

TOWN OF KITTERY, MAINE
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
Council Chambers

APPROVED
February 28, 2013

Meeting called to order at 6:06 p.m.

Board Members Present: Deborah Driscoll, Tom Emerson, Susan Tuveson, Mark Alessi, Ann Grinnell, Rich Balano

Members absent: Bob Melanson

Staff: Gerry Mylroie, Town Planner; Chris DiMatteo, Assistant Planner

Pledge to the Flag

Minutes: January 24, 2013

Mr. Balano moved to accept as amended

Ms. Grinnell seconded

Unanimous

Minutes: February 14, 2013

Ms. Grinnell moved to accept as amended

Mr. Balano seconded

Unanimous

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Gail Burns, Wilson Road, stated she has a problem with the wording regarding ‘general pattern of development’ in a report to council dated 1/22/13, and read: *The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has had an enormous impact on the town regarding traffic, parking, school enrollment, and environmental contamination.* She commented that, as a town document, this statement seems extremely negative, as the shipyard employs 4,700 people, and noted many people have fought to keep the shipyard open. She was shocked to read wording that references the shipyard negatively as the shipyard provides employment in two states and has ‘put Kittery on the map’. She also read: *As retail outlet malls on Route 1 have proliferated, Downtown Kittery has become a focus of attention as residents seek to establish an area for themselves distinct from the areas in town which cater to the non-resident.* To refer to Route 1 as catering to non-residents is bad, as people buy clothes in areas outside of the Foreside. The outlets provide jobs and direct business to local establishments such as the Clam Hut, Weathervane and Trading Post. She does not like the splitting up of Kittery as resident vs. non-resident uses, and it is unfortunate that town management thinks of the outlets in these terms. The outlet center is one of the first things people see when crossing the high level bridge. **Mr. Mylroie** explained these statements were prepared in the 1999 comp plan document and will be reviewed and updated.

Peter McLeod, 46 Norton Road, noted the Chair in the last meeting regarding the Thresher indicated he was present at the July 28, 2011 meeting, but he was not, though he may have been present at earlier discussions. Ms. Driscoll was not on the Board at that time, though in the audience speaking about 60-foot building heights. Mr. Emerson stated that meeting was prior to the 7/28/11 meeting and he was at the public hearing and at least three other meetings where the amendment was discussed and the Board was fully aware of what was going on prior to the vote. He apologized that he was off by one week. Mr. McLeod agreed it was two separate meetings.

PUBLIC HEARING/OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 1– Title 16 Land Use Development Code Amendments.

Action: Hold a public hearing, review proposed amendment and determine if to make recommendation to Town Council to adopt. A change to the lighting standards is proposed to allow for the inclusion of LED

lights. Section 16.8.24.2.F to read as follows: Lamps in exterior light fixtures must be incandescent, metal halide, high pressure sodium, or Light Emitting Diodes (LED).

The Public Hearing opened at 6:31 p.m.

David Lincoln, Kittery Cove, questioned if reason for the change is the memorial bridge lighting. Mr. Emerson stated not entirely, as there are other projects including the Masonic Building who specifically requested use of LED. Mr. Lincoln stated if LED lighting is proposed for the flagpole he suggests the Board look at 16.8.24.3 Illumination Standards for Nonresidential Uses.

Peter McLeod, Norton Road, asked if this is new or only the LED addition. It was explained only the LED addition is new. If this the public hearing and there's other wording why is it not included in the agenda item? It was explained this information can be found at town hall one week prior to the meeting. He stated the technology is relatively new and is used where it is cold where it works better, but it has problems with ice and snow. Some design standards are needed as there are multiple colors, and doesn't want Kittery to look like Christmas every day of the year. The use of metal halide lights has produced different colors as well and you don't want too white a light. The technology has not been perfected and Kittery doesn't need to go there now. There needs to be a standard for lighting flagpoles so it's not too dim. If LED lights are being used now, against code, the Code Enforcement Officer should be looking into this. He accepted Mr. Emerson's apology.

Mr. Emerson explained lighting brightness is expressed in lumens and perhaps in regard to the flagpole this is how it should be addressed. LED lights can be used in any standard light socket, so he is sure many people are using them because they are so long-lasting. Essentially, we are attempting to codify something that is already in existence.

The Public Hearing closed at 6:43 p.m.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Balano asked about additional ordinance language included by staff. **Mr. Mylroie** explained that photometrics provided during a site plan review is different when using LED vs. other lighting methods. The additional language is to assure the photometric analysis is consistent with industry standards when using LED lighting. **Ms. Grinnell** asked to move this to a later time in the meeting so the Board could address Lynch Lane, as she had questions about color. **Mr. Balano** stated any light can be replaced with a color light. **Ms. Tuveson** stated colored lighting would part of Design Standards, and should be application specific and not included as part of the code in this section. **Mr. Emerson** stated this technology allows for the ability to change colors. **Mr. Balano** agreed that color lighting is application specific. **Ms. Driscoll** asked why fluorescent lighting is excluded from this code section. **Mr. Emerson** stated probably because newer forms of lighting have evolved. **Ms. Driscoll** suggested the amendment read:

Lamps in exterior light fixtures must be incandescent, metal halide, high pressure sodium, compact fluorescent, or Light Emitting Diodes (LED).

Ms. Tuveson moved to accept changes to Title 16.8.24.2.F as follows:

Lamps in exterior light fixtures must be incandescent, metal halide, high pressure sodium, compact fluorescent or Light Emitting Diodes (LED). This provision does not prohibit the use of fluorescent lamps in internally lighted signs where such signs are otherwise permitted, provided such signs meet the requirements of this Article. See the Design Handbook for appropriate examples of signs. With the use of LED lighting, the applicant is required to demonstrate that standards within this article are met and/or meet comparable accepted standards for LED exterior lighting. Required photometric test reports for LED lighting must be based on the IESNA LM-79-08 test procedure.

Ms. Driscoll seconded

Ms. Grinnell stated she would be in favor of this amendment if a color standard for lighting is addressed in the Design Handbook. **Ms. Driscoll** suggested this could be included as an update to the Design Handbook in a future agenda item. **Ms. Grinnell** agreed.

Motion carries unanimously

ITEM 2 – Lynch Lane Subdivision– Modification to an Approved Plan Review.

Action: Hold a public hearing, review, and accept or deny plan application. Lynch Lane Association, Inc., owner and applicant, proposes to modify the previously approved subdivision plan to allow for Street Acceptance consideration. Property is located off Bartlett Road, identified as Tax Map 68 Lot 4A, ±54.9 acres in the Residential Rural (R-RL) Zone.

Mr. Mylroie summarized the issue, explaining an original approval condition stated the road was not to become a public road. Following review by the DPW Commissioner, it was agreed the road has been constructed to town standards and could be presented to Council for acceptance. The Board must first amend the subdivision plan by deleting the original condition prior to recommendation to Council.

The Public Hearing opened at 6:59 p.m.

Brett Costa, 19 Lynch Lane, concurred with Mr. Mylroie's summary. He read a portion of letter from former DPW Commissioner Rick Rossiter:

In the past Kittery has had so called "forever private" road subdivisions that due to being built near or close to Town standards have become accepted "public", i.e., Captains Way and Wheelhouse Way.

And then goes on to mention that Lynch Lane is headed down this path. Also, Title 16.8.5.2 Acceptance of Streets and Ways Required in the Public Interest:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Section hereof, the Town may at any time lay out and accept any street or way in the Town as a public street or way of said Town whenever the general public interest so requires.

There was no further public comment.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:01 p.m.

Mr. Mylroie stated the Board would need to make a Findings of Fact in order to proceed with the deletion of the original condition. **Ms. Driscoll** noted there are 3 notes on the original plan that would need to be removed:

3. *The fee interest of the right of way and common land will be owned in common by the owners of Lots 1 through 12.*
4. *The right of way will remain privately owned. The road will not become a "Town Road."*
5. *A homeowner's association will be established to maintain the roadway and common land.*

Mr. Costa stated items 3 and 5 have been accomplished and the association would assign ownership to the Town. Discussion followed regarding how the change of the plan and recordation of an amended plan. **Ms. Grinnell** stated the Council needs to consider whether they will accept the plan, but conditions need to be removed first. **Mr. Costa** explained there are four lots that are not part of the association ownership of the road. The Lynch Lane Association is unanimously supportive of this request.

Mr. Mylroie stated the Board will need to forward the Association's public road request to Council at a separate meeting. **Ms. Driscoll** asked if all other issues regarding this subdivision are consistent. **Mr. Mylroie** and **Mr. Costa** stated it is, and the roadway exceeds town standards. **Ms. Grinnell** stated that notes indicate it does not entirely conform to standards. **Mr. DiMatteo** explained the centerline radius is at 100' vs. 150' but, that has not been changed. **Ms. Driscoll** asked if the motion can be contingent upon acceptance by the Council. Discussion followed regarding recordation within the 90-day time period and the Council review period.

Ms. Tuveson moved that the Board accepts or denies Lynch Lane Association, Inc. applicant, represented by Brett Costa, 19 Lynch Lane, Kittery Point, Maine, requests for the removal of prior subdivision approval (8/12/99) Note 3. The fee interest of the right of way and common land will be owned in common by the owners of Lots 1 through 12; note 4. The right of way will remain privately owned. The road will not become a "Town Road"; and note 5. A homeowner's association will be established to

maintain the roadway and common land. Property is identified as Tax Map 68 Lot 4 and 4A in the Residential-Rural Zone.

Ms Grinnell Seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

NOW THEREFORE, based on the entire record before the Planning Board as and pursuant to the applicable standards in the Land Use and Development Code, the Planning Board makes the following factual findings as required by Section **16.10.8.3.4. as recorded below:**

FINDINGS OF FACT

Action by the board shall be based upon findings of fact which certify or waive compliance with all the required standards of this title, and which certify that the development satisfies the following requirements:
A. Development Conforms to Local Ordinances. <i>The proposed development conforms to a duly adopted comprehensive plan as per adopted provisions in the Town Code, zoning ordinance, subdivision regulation or ordinance, development plan or land use plan, if any. In making this determination, the municipal reviewing authority may interpret these ordinances and plans.</i>
There is no development associated with this application. The review is focused on whether the Board agrees to amend the previously approved subdivision plan ("Lynch Lane") of August 12, 1999 by removing the following Notes and re-recording the amended subdivision plan: <i>3. The fee interest of the right of way and common land will be owned in common by the owners of Lots 1 through 12. 4. The right of way will remain privately owned. The road will not become a "Town Road." 5. A homeowner's association will be established to maintain the roadway and common land.</i>
Vote of <u>6</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
B. Freshwater Wetlands Identified; C. River, Stream or Brook Identified; D. Water Supply Sufficient; E. Municipal Water Supply Available; F. Sewage Disposal Adequate; G. Municipal Solid Waste Disposal Available; H. Water Body Quality and Shoreline Protected; I. Groundwater Protected; J. Flood Areas Identified and Development Conditioned; K. Stormwater Managed; L. Erosion Controlled; M. Traffic Managed; N. Water and Air Pollution Minimized; O. Aesthetic, Cultural and Natural Values Protected;
The Board concurs that standards B-O are <u>not applicable to the proposed amendment</u> .
Vote of <u>6</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
P. Developer Financially and Technically Capable. <i>Developer is financially and technically capable to meet the standards of this section.</i>
The Applicant appears to meet this standard.
Vote of <u>6</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining

NOW THEREFORE the Kittery Planning Board adopts each of the foregoing Findings of Fact and based on these Findings determines the proposed Development will have no significant detrimental impact. The Kittery Planning Board hereby grants Final Approval for the Development at the above referenced property, with waivers granted as noted and any conditions per Title 16.10.8.2 as noted.

Vote of 6 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

Waivers: (No waivers requested)

Conditions – *Title 16.10.8.2.6 The decision of the Planning Board plus any conditions must be noted on three copies of the final plan to be recorded at the York County registry of Deeds, when required. One copy must be returned to the applicant, one retained by the Town Planner and one forwarded to the Code Enforcement Officer.* (No conditions included)

ACCORDINGLY, THE PLANNING BOARD HEREBY MOVES TO:

1. Approve the Findings of Fact and incorporate the approval into the meeting minutes,
2. Approve the final Plan with any conditions of approval, and authorize the Planning Board Chairman to sign the final Plan upon confirmation by the Town Planner of final plan compliance.

Approved by the Kittery Planning Board on February 28, 2013

Vote of 6 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

Instructions/Notice to Applicant:

1. Prior to the release of the signed plans, the applicant must pay all outstanding fees associated with the permitting, including, but not limited to, Town Attorney fees, peer review, newspaper advertisements and abutter notification.
2. State law requires all subdivision plans, and any plans receiving waivers or variances, be recorded at the York County Registry of Deeds within 90 days of the final approval.
3. Per Title 16.6.2.A - An aggrieved party with legal standing may appeal a final decision of the Planning Board to the York County Superior Court in accordance with Maine Rules of Civil Procedures Section 80B, within forty-five (45) days from the date the decision by the Planning Board was rendered.
4. This approval by the Planning Board constitutes an agreement between the Town and the Developer, incorporating as elements the Development Plan and supporting documentation, the Planning Board Findings of Fact, and any Conditions of Approval.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 3 – Residential-Rural (R-RL) and Residential-Rural Conservation (R-RC) Zone Standards, Title 16 Land Use Development Code Amendments.

Action: Discuss proposed amendments and schedule a public hearing if warranted. In an effort to execute policy recommendations in Kittery's Comprehensive Plan, the Comprehensive Plan Update Committee is recommending that the Town Code be amended to reflect the existing Comprehensive Plan policy on density for the R-RL and R-RC zones. The proposal is to amend the current density from 1 dwelling unit per 40,000 S.F. (R-RL) and 80,000 S.F. (R-RC) to 1 dwelling unit per 3 acres. Members from the Comp Plan Update Committee and the Kittery Open Space Committee have been invited to attend.

Mr. Emerson advised this is not a public hearing, but a workshop for the three boards.

Workshop discussion: [due to the workshop nature of this item, identification of individual comments was not always possible]

Mr. Mylroie summarized the amendment proposal:

The 2002 Comprehensive Plan policy identifies no-growth/restricted growth area consistent with State Planning laws. These areas currently limit development to one dwelling unit per acre. The purpose is the concern that municipal operating expenses such as sewer and water lines are higher if development is spread out and not clustered. The plan recommended density reduction of 1 dwelling unit per 1-3 acres. Under current cluster ordinance about 4,000 homes could be built in these restricted growth areas. History has indicated Kittery only requires approximately 200 homes per 10 years; however, approximately 500 homes have been built and the population has declined by 25 people. The Comp Plan Update Committee has felt that in order to allocate growth as directed, this part of town needs to be further evaluated. Even moving to 3 acres per dwelling unit, approximately 1,200 homes could be built. The proposal would allow a home to be built on those existing lots that are less than 3 acres. The cluster ordinance allows for multi-sized lots on larger parcels of land while creating open space and blending into the surrounding rural area. There was discussion regarding wetlands as part of the total acreage. Mr. Emerson explained wetlands, constrained land, setbacks, etc. do not count toward developable acreage. Joe Falzone stated he has 60 acres under contract and asked why there is a change from 40,000 sf to 3 acres per dwelling unit in less than one year since the cluster ordinance has been adopted, though not yet tested. Mr. Emerson explained the Comprehensive Plan is driving this density discussion. Mr. Mylroie explained the change will reduce the density allowed, not how the development is designed. Niles Pinkham asked if a lot is wet, as long as there's a building envelope, a home can be built. Mr. Emerson explained the reason for conservation zoning (clustering) is to permit open space. This proposal could be deleterious to open space, only discourages growth north of Haley, and does not address rural character. Russell White noted this cites the old comp plan where we should be looking at what is needed and address that. What was the point of this recommendation in the old comp plan? He believed it was to address open space. Ms. Driscoll explained the intent is to determine if the new cluster ordinance is adequate or if the comp plan should be changed. Ms. Grinnell asked if this issue has been adequately addressed with the cluster ordinance, as this proposal will cause hardship on property owners. Vern Gardner stated the Comp Plan Committee solicited input from the public and found the area north of Spruce Creek to be the most sensitive to development. The general thought was to limit development in that area by zoning from 40,000 sf to 3 acres. The intent is to preserve the character of the community north of Spruce Creek and direct development to areas having water and sewer. Mr. Balano stated though the plan is aged, it is still in place, and the intent was to preserve the rural character and green spaces which is still important. Should the comp plan now be modified to include cluster development? Ms. Spiller asked Mr. Emerson what he meant by deleterious to open space. He explained large single family lots create suburbia and sprawl, not open space. Discussion continued regarding open space vs. large single lot density. Craig Wilson stated the Open Space Committee endorses the proposal and will be submitting a proposal to study unfragmented open space. He suggested transfer of development rights. Discussion followed regarding development design ideas to achieve open space. Vern Gardner suggested fees for development could be used for sensitive areas, such as the Agamenticus to the Sea corridor. Chris DiMatteo commented discussion has centered on subdivision development, but lot splits and right-of-way creation impacts potential development. [Unidentified] is this proposal being considered as 'emergency' and if so, why is that? Mr. Emerson stated that has not yet been decided. Russell White stated Jeff Clifford disputed the methodology of these numbers and asked for his input. Jeff Clifford stated there are 139 lots on 369 acres, or 2.65 acres per lot (20-30,000 sf each), the rest being open space, or 235 acres out of 369. Of those 7 projects 64% of the land is open space; 243 acres is upland, equaling 1.75 acres of upland per lot created. These lots are in the middle of the areas under discussion. The comp plan stated 1-3 acres and included variables based on the land, such as soil. He further explained a conventional vs. cluster subdivision calculations. The existing wetland maps do not adequately reflect the actual wetlands – the shape of the land is key. Mr. Mylroie suggested there would be approximately 45 lots with open space under the current ordinance, while retaining the rural character, rather than more units. Ms. Tuveson felt it appears land is running out to apply the higher restrictions of three acres based

on the land characteristics. Craig Wilson asked how to encourage growth where the services exist. Vern Gardner noted adequate soils are needed which could limit development, and using percentage open space rather than size would limit development. [Unidentified] Who has a stake in this proposal? Who is living in these zones? Mr. Emerson stated the Board is directed by the comp plan. [Unidentified] Who has brought this up now? Mr. Emerson stated the comp plan is being updated by law, requiring these discussions. Peter McLeod noted the state has passed environmental laws preventing development in certain areas. This proposal would reduce the value of my land, but the taxes will not diminish. Now a young person can buy a house lot for \$50,000, but this proposal would triple the cost to the buyer. Mr. Emerson stated a transfer of development rights would allow someone to receive a density bonus to build in a higher density area for paying you to keep your land undeveloped. The workshop ended at 8:31 p.m.

Mr. Emerson proposed to move Item 3 to a public hearing to hear public comment. **Mr. Balano** suggested the Board receive more input from the Opens Space and Conservation Committee and perhaps amend the proposal in light of the cluster ordinance. **Mr. Emerson** thought the public hearing could inform them further. **Ms. Driscoll** believes this should be work shopped further and provide more information to the comp plan update committee. **Mr. Balano** recommended not going further with a 3-acre proposal. **Ms. Grinnell** believes the cluster ordinance addresses these open space issues and the old comp plan desire for open space. Discussion followed regarding density issues in other parts of town and how to encourage development in serviced areas. Members concurred a further workshop is needed and the committees need to be informed of ordinance changes that may achieve the goals of the comprehensive plan, and a public hearing will not be scheduled at this time.

Mr. Emerson proposed the Board move to Item 6 at this time. Members concurred.

ITEM 4 – Board Member Items: Comments and Discussion

A. Elect Board Officials

Chairman:

Mr. Balano nominated Tom Emerson

Ms. Grinnell seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Vice-Chairman:

Mr. Balano nominated Debbie Driscoll

Ms. Grinnell seconded

Ms. Driscoll declined

Mr. Balano and Ms. Grinnell removed their nomination

Ms. Grinnell nominated Susan Tuveson

Mr. Balano seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Secretary:

Ms. Grinnell nominated Debbie Driscoll

Ms. Tuveson seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

B. Other

Ann Grinnell:

- asked for Building Permits be included in first monthly packets;
- agenda items be more specific and receive a copy of legal notices for public hearings;
- unbundle Title 16 amendments in agenda items;
- do not include Council documents when reviewing ordinance amendments for the first time;
- Letter from Gay Lakin [not available for minutes]. Board discussion followed regarding combination of ordinance amendments in a single agenda item. Ms. Tuveson asked about projecting documents on a screen for public viewing. Discussion followed regarding electronic submittals and posting of ordinance amendments on-line, and retention of meeting videos beyond one year.
- The Board should workshop ordinance amendments prior to a public hearing, then schedule a public hearing.
- Alternate Board agendas with applications and ordinance amendments for six months, beginning May, 2013.

Debbie Driscoll

- Board training from SMRPC or MMA. Discussion followed regarding limiting public comment to a specific time period. Mr. DiMatteo suggested re-visiting the Board's By-Laws regarding process and procedure and updating if necessary.

Tom Emerson

- Curb cut on Fernald Road. What is happening here? Mr. Mylroie stated a curb cut was approved by State and DPW to access property for tree cutting. If they cross the threshold by creating a road or lots, they must appear before the Planning Board. He will notify the DEP that when such applications are received by the State, the Planning Office be notified. Mr. Emerson stated 'roads to nowhere' should not be allowed and such activity needs Board review. Mr. Mylroie stated curb cuts and driveways for a single family home requires Code review not Board review. Discussion followed regarding driveway lengths and potential for further subdivision off 500 foot 'driveways'.

There was no further Board comment.

ITEM 5 –Town Planner Items – Not discussed

- A. Kittery Foreside Plan;
- B. Comprehensive Plan Update (Housing, Economy, Land Use, Transportation)
- C. Other

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 6 –Wallingford Square LLC – Modification to an Approved Plan. Action: Accept or deny plan application and schedule a public hearing. Wallingford Sq. LLC, owner and applicant, requests approval to amend the previously approved Site Plan to redevelop the former Masonic building and associated site located at 7-17 Wallingford Sq., Tax Map 4, Lot 106, Mixed Use Kittery Foreside Zone. Agent is Deane Rykerson, Rykerson Architecture.

Mr. Rykerson summarized the changes to the site plan including leaving the existing ATM in place, but moving the roof above, providing a handicapped through area. A ROW would be left for DPW access to a manhole at the rear (tables would be moved when needed) and the sidewalk would be at street level. Interior changes include one less stairway on the first floor; second floor would have one new bathroom and a new stairway going down; the third floor has one loft apartment instead of two, with alterations to the catering kitchen, and addition of a bathroom. Parking spaces have not changed though less are

required with the revisions. The storefront entries will be retained with two new entries, new aluminum windows, and lighting unchanged. He presented a lighting plan, requesting a street light be installed to illuminate a parking area. The lighting designer suggested providing a lighting mock-up for the LED lights and take readings from there. A waiver of the photometric plan will be needed if this is acceptable. **Mr. Emerson** asked about the bank piece that will be separated. **Mr. Rykerson** does not yet know, but removing the roof piece will add light. **Ms. Tuveson** asked about the aluminum storefront system. **Mr. Rykerson** explained it is a narrow piece of aluminum with glass and thermal break.

Ms. Grinnell moved to accept the application and schedule a public hearing.

Ms. Tuveson seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Mr. Emerson proposed to move Item 3 to a public hearing to hear public comment. **Mr. Balano** suggested the Board receive more input from the Open Space and Conservation Committee and perhaps amend the proposal in light of the cluster ordinance. **Mr. Emerson** thought the public hearing could inform them further. **Ms. Driscoll** believes this should be work shopped further and provide more information to the comp plan update committee. **Mr. Balano** recommended not going further with a 3-acre proposal. **Ms. Grinnell** believes the cluster ordinance addresses these open space issues and the old comp plan desire for open space. Discussion followed regarding density issues in other parts of town and how to encourage development in serviced areas. Members concurred a further workshop is needed and the committees need to be informed of ordinance changes that may achieve the goals of the comprehensive plan, and a public hearing will not be scheduled at this time.

The Kittery Planning Board meeting of February 28, 2013 adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Submitted by Jan Fisk, Recorder – March 6, 2013